

1 If one looks at Figure 4, the only continuous flexible layer is the tape layer 30. Layers 18 and 16
2 are attached to each other as by the glue 32 not shown in Figure 4. As noted, the offset here is
3 to permit the bending around the flexible tape 30. The two panel segments the smaller being 16
4 is physically glued to the larger one 16 in Figure 4. Applicant does not do that.

5 The Examiner's commentaries with respect to the purpose of the offset is understood, but
6 the Examiner is basing her contention on a premise, in that the structural sameness or satisfaction
7 of the claims structural limitations of applicants is NOT shown by this structure. The reference
8 deals with oranges and applicants are dealing with apples. The reference is not applicable.

9 It is further believed that the Examiner misunderstands the status of the prior art as shown
10 in Figure 1 of this application. What the applicant has demonstrated is a two part invention. First,
11 the conventional technique of utilizing battens, behind the seam of a plurality of abutted adjacent
12 fibreglass sheets, can be avoided as shown in Figure 2 by the use of the offset principle. Contrast
13 Figure 2, to Figure 4. This illustrates the first aspect of the invention as shown in claims 6 and
14 7. This is an unexpected result, in that the necessity to provide for the possibility of a bullet going
15 through the seam of adjacent abutted sheets of fibreglass is overcome by the use of the offset.
16 Therefore, it is unnecessary to use the thickness of the batten behind the main sheets of
17 fibreglass. Again, note the distinctions between Figures 2 and 4. This is indeed labor saving and
18 cost saving.

19 The second aspect of the invention, as shown in claim 8, wherein the higher level of
20 protection is provided toward the interior of the protection zone. Nothing is shown in the art to
21 achieve this concept. It was applicants' unique discovery that the use of lower level material at
22 lower expense, material-wise and labor wise, one can obtain a higher level of protection than
23 would be anticipated. Nothing in the claimed patent, the only reference cited by the Examiner
24 addresses this issue of increased level of protection.

25 It is believed that all claims in the case are allowable. However counsel is not tied to the
26 current language and would be willing to consider minor amendments, should the Examiner
27 deem such to be necessary in order to pass this case to issue.

28
29 Respectfully submitted,

30
31 Mark C. Jacobs, 24043

32 Attorney for Applicant(s)